Remarks: General

The specification has been amended to add thereto a notation of the claim to benefit made in the ADS of this application as to the prior U.S. provisional application.

The claims have been amended by rewriting Claim 1 to cover a more particularized embodiment of this invention, and by rewriting Claim 8 to correct a typographical error. In addition, Claims 10~14 have been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof, and new Claims 15~24 have been added.

No new matter is added by the amendment to Claim 1 or by the addition of Claims 15~24. New Claims 15~24 correspond to original or previously presented claims as follows:

Claims 15 and 20 correspond to Claim 1, Claims 16 and 21 correspond to Claim 4, Claim 17 corresponds to Claim 7, Claims 18 and 23 correspond to Claim 8, Claims 19 and 24 correspond to Claim 9, and Claim 22 corresponds to Claim 6.

The amendment to Claim 8 is not related to patentability inasmuch as is it made for the purpose of correcting a typographical error.

By Applicant's calculation, no fee is due by reason of the addition of new Claims 15~24. The cancellation of Claims 10~14 has been taken into account in the fee calculation. If, however, Applicant's calculation is in error, please charge any required fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1928 (E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company).

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR §1.114 is enclosed, the fee for which should be charged to Deposit Account No. 04-1928. A petition under 37 CFR §1.136 for a three-month extension of time to respond to the Examiner's action is enclosed, the fee for which should be charged to Deposit Account No. 04-1928.

If any fee other than or in addition to those mentioned specifically above is required to authorize or obtain consideration of this response, please charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1928.

Claims 1, 4, 6~9 and 15~24 are now active in the application. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and further examination of the application in view of the reasons it has set forth below for allowance of the claims.

Remarks: Detailed Action

I.

In Item 3, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 4 and 6~9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 936,504 ("Miyake").

Miyake discloses Resin IA, which contains Monomer C, Monomer D and optionally other monomers including Monomer P. Monomer C has an alicyclic functional group containing a polar group; the polar group is exemplified as a hydroxyl group. Monomer D contains a functional group capable of producing an alkali-soluble group that is soluble by an acid. Monomer P has a reactive group that is exemplified by a hydroxyl or acid group.

Miyake also discloses Resin IIA, which contains Monomers D and E, which copolymerize, and Monomer G, which reacts with Monomer E as incorporated into the polymer chain. Monomers E and G may both have either an acid or an epoxy group, and for the purpose of the reaction between them, Monomer E has an acid group when Monomer G has an epoxy group, and vice versa. Resin IIA may also contain optional Monomer H, which includes Monomer H1, partly exemplified as being the same as Monomer P, and Monomer H2, which contains an alicyclic group.

The polymer utilized in Claim 1 is distinguishable from the Miyake Resin IA in view of the fact that the Claim 1 polymer consists essentially of the monomers of structures (i) and (ii) ["Monomer (i)" and "Monomer (ii)"]. As such, Resin IA does not teach or suggest the presence in a polymer of Applicant's Monomer (i) when Monomer (i) has a cyclic structure since the presence thereon of the polar groups of Monomer C would change the fundamental characteristics of Monomer (i) as a component of the polymer. Resin IA does not teach or suggest the polymer utilized in Claim 1 when Monomer (i) has a branched structure because Resin IA requires the presence of the Monomer C, which would be an added monomeric component of the polymer, and thus change its fundamental characteristics.

The Miyake Resin IIA does not teach or suggest the polymer utilized in Claim 1 because Resin IIA requires the presence of Monomer E as bonded to Monomer G, which would be an added

monomeric component of the polymer, and thus change its fundamental characteristics.

The polymer utilized in Claim 15 is distinguishable from the Miyake Resin IA in view of the fact that fact that the Claim 15 polymer consists essentially of Monomer (i) and Monomer (ii). As such, Resin IA does not teach or suggest the presence of a Monomer (i) in a polymer of Applicant's Claim 15 since the presence on the cyclic structure thereof of the polar groups of Monomer C would change the fundamental characteristics of Monomer (i) as a component of the polymer of Claim 15.

The Miyake Resin IIA does not teach or suggest the polymer utilized in Claim 15 because Resin IIA requires the presence of Monomer E as bonded to Monomer G, which would be an added monomeric component of the polymer, and thus change its fundamental characteristics.

Neither the Miyake Resin IA nor the Miyake Resin IIA teaches or suggests the polymer utilized in Claim 20 because there is not disclosed for either resin a monomer corresponding the alkyl terminated either acrylate as described for the Monomer (ii) of Claim 20.

In view of the distinctions as discussed above between the subject matter of Claim 1 and Miyake, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 4 and 6~9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant further submits that Claims 15~24 are patentable over Miyake for similar reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections have been properly traversed, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, request for which is hereby respectfully made.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 32,255

Telephone: (302) 992-4362 Facsimile: (302) 992-5374